

MNFRAME 032
A
DSH/jmc/ACC



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/942,005	10/01/97	CHARI	MNFRAME.032A

LM02/0930
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SIXTEENTH FLOOR
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660-8016

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2758

DATE MAILED: 09/30/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

DOCKETED ON: OCT 05 1999
BY: SA VERIFIED BY: [Signature]
ACTION: final amend due November 30, 1999
DUE DATE: notice of appeal due 30, 1999
statutory deadlines December 30, 1999
FINAL DEADLINE: March 30, 2000
ATTY: DSH/jmc/ACC
ATTORNEY VERIFICATION OF DUE DATE AND FINAL DEADLINE:

Office Action Summary

Application No:

08/942,005

Applicant(s)

Chari et al.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Group Art Unit

2758☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 6, 1999☒ This action is **FINAL**. ~~MF~~☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-34 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-34 is/are rejected.☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.**Application Papers**☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed on Aug 4, 1999 is ☒ approved ☐ disapproved.☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been☐ received.☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).**Attachment(s)**☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 7-8, 10, 13☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on July 6, 1999. Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 25, 28, 29, and 34 were amended. Claim 26 has been canceled. Claims 1-25, and 27-34 are pending examination. Claims 1-25, and 27-34 represent an apparatus directed toward an alert configurator and manager.

2. A substitute specification excluding the claims is required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(a) because the amendment to the specification filed on July 6, 1999 contains numerous changes .

A substitute specification filed under 37 CFR 1.125(a) must only contain subject matter from the original specification and any previously entered amendment under 37 CFR 1.121. If the substitute specification contains additional subject matter not of record, the substitute specification must be filed under 37 CFR 1.125(b) and must be accompanied by: 1) a statement that the substitute specification contains no new matter; and 2) a marked-up copy showing the amendments to be made via the substitute specification relative to the specification at the time the substitute specification is filed.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-25, 27-29, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnell et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081.

Bonnell teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system for monitoring and managing computer resources and applications across a distributed computing environment using an intelligent autonomous agent architecture.

As per claim 1, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of at least one processor, said processor configured to receive a plurality of alerts, said alerts providing status information about different components in the computer using CPU 18 of server computer system 14 (see fig. 11; col. 9)

Bonnell further teaches an event manager executing in said processor, said event manager configured to selectively disable a display of one or more of said alerts to the user, said event manager further configured to record said status information associated with said alerts in a storage medium using event manager 210 and event repository 206 (see fig. 12; col. 9-12).

Bonnell does not explicitly state the limitation of an alert module. However, Bonnell discloses an event manager that is responsible for keeping a record of various occurrences throughout the computer including occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution (see col. 9-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying the event manager as taught by Bonnell as an alert module since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claim 2, wherein said alert module contains a plurality of variables, some of said variables indicating whether each of said alerts is disabled or enabled to be displayed to the user (see fig. 22; col. 13, Bonnell discloses a data structure for implementing event filtering at the agent software which passes data regarding certain events to management consoles interested in those events).

As to claim 3, wherein said alert module records information about said disabled alerts in said storage medium at a user computer (see fig. 15; col. 10, Bonnell discloses a set of event catalogs 220-224 containing enumerated records regarding event descriptions).

As to claim 4, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of a log module at a user computer, said log module configured to store information about said enabled and disabled alerts (see fig. 13; col. 2, and 9, Bonnell discloses a set event manager 52 and event cache 212 is responsible for keeping records of various occurrences throughout the computer network, such as occurrence of alarm conditions).

As to claim 5, wherein said log module stores a name of said component associated with one of said alerts using event description field (see fig. 15; col. 10).

As per claim 6, wherein said log module stores a recommended course of action associated with one of said alerts (see fig. 13; col. 2, and 9, Bonnell discloses a set event manager 52 and event cache 212 responsible for keeping records of various occurrences throughout the computer network, such as occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution).

As to claim 7, a user interface which allows a user to select one or more of said alerts for display to the user by providing a description of said alerts using graphical interface module 50 (see fig. 13; col. 2, Bonnell discloses graphical user interface 50 which coordinates the representation and display of alarm conditions).

As per claims 8-9, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation wherein said user interface is configured to enable said selected alerts in response to an enable command, or disable said selected alerts in response to a disable command (see fig. 22; col. 13, Bonnell discloses a data structure for implementing event filtering at the agent software which passes data regarding certain events to management consoles interested in those events).

As to claims 10-12, wherein said alerts which were not selectively disabled for display by the user are displayed in an alert notification window to the user, that is configured to display the name of said component associated with one of said alerts, and is configured to display the recommended course of action (see fig. 13; col. 2, Bonnell discloses graphical user interface 50 which coordinates the representation and display of alarm conditions).

As to claim 13, a first computer comprising a plurality of components, said first computer configured to generate a event message regarding the status of at least one of said

resources, said message comprising a first code which contains data about said resource, said first code having a first data length (see figs. 15, 24, and 25; col. 13-14, Bonnell discloses that an event message is sent from agent software running on a server to the management software running on the management console).

a management software existing in a second computer, said management software configured to receive said message from said first computer, said management software further configured to transform said message into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein said second data length is significantly greater than said first data length (see col. 2, Bonnell discloses an object database manager 48 which creates and maintains a database 49 representing all of the resources and applications as objects, as well as information pertaining to the state of those objects, in a form that will be readily useable by a graphical user interface module 50. Graphical user interface 50 is responsible for communicating with display driver software in order to present visual representations of objects on the display of network management computer system 10. Such representations typically take the form of icons for objects. Also, graphical user interface module 50 coordinates the representation of pop-up windows for command menus and the display of requested or monitored data).

Bonnell does not explicitly state the limitation of a status module. However, Bonnell discloses Manager software system 34 that is responsible for keeping a record of various occurrences throughout the computer network including occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution (see col. 2-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying the Manager software system 34 as "status module" since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claim 14, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation wherein said first computer and said second computer are connected by a computer network (see fig. 1).

As per claim 15, Bonnell does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein said computer network performs simple network management protocol SNMP transactions.

However, Bonnell discloses an embodiment which includes an agent, collector, and a management console which uses SNMP traps to send messages concerning monitored resources

(see figs. 27a-27b; col. 14-15). Furthermore, using SNMP transactions in a network is notoriously well known in the data communication network art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying transactions using SNMP for communications between agent software 36, and manager system software 36. One would be motivated to use SNMP transactions in a network to allow for the remote monitoring and updating of devices in the network and lessen the burden of problem management on the management console.

As per claims 16-21, the rejection of claims 1-15 is fully applied herein. Further, Bonnell does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein said first code contains an index; wherein said status module uses said index to identify said user-friendly display message; wherein said index is predefined by a management information base; wherein said management information associates information about said component with said index; wherein said status module uses said information about said component from said management information base to generate said user-friendly display message. However, Bonnell discloses a knowledge module parser 44 that is responsible for accessing knowledge module 38 and parsing the information therein for use by knowledge database manager 46, which in turn creates and maintains database 47 of knowledge that is more readily useable by manager software 34, and event manager 52 that is responsible for keeping records of alarms in the network and their resolution (see fig. 2; col. 2).

The use of an index that points to a base of information is well known in the data processing art and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying a index in the event reported to the management console.

Claims 22-24, and 34 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-21 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons

5. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnell et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081 in view of Dulman, U.S. Patent No. 5,802,146.

Bonnell teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system for monitoring and managing computer resources and applications across a distributed computing environment using an intelligent autonomous agent architecture.

As to claim 25, Bonnell discloses an apparatus for displaying a system management user interface, comprising:

at least one computer, said computer comprising a plurality of components, said computer configured to generate a plurality of alerts, said alerts associated with status information of said plurality of components (see figs. 15, 24, and 25; col. 13-14, Bonnell discloses that an event message is sent from agent software running on a server to the management software running on the management console).

A display executing in a manager computer, said display configured to allow a user to select at least two of said alerts (see fig. 13; col. 2, Bonnell discloses graphical user interface 50 which coordinates the representation and display of alarm conditions).

an event manager executing in the manager computer, said event manager configured to enable or disable the display of one or more of said selected alerts to the user (see fig. 12; col. 9-12).

Bonnell does not explicitly state the limitation of an alert module. However, Bonnell discloses an event manager that is responsible for keeping a record of various occurrences throughout the computer including occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution (see col. 9-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying the event manager as taught by Bonnell as an alert module since the same functionality is achieved.

Bonnell does not explicitly disclose the claimed limitation of enabling or disabling the display of any combination of selected said alerts in response to a single command from the user.

However, Dulman teaches a maintenance operations console for an advanced intelligent network where a user interface is provided at the MOC displaying a graphical window view of alarms where the user can select an alarm view by clicking on a corresponding alarm icon which disables the view of the non-selected alarm icon and provides a description of the selected alarm

(see figs. 9a-9h; col. 17-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell in view of Dulman by specifying a graphical user interface that isolates the selected alarm so that information pertaining the selected alarm is displayed. One would be motivated to do so to allow a user to isolate alarms and obtain further information regarding the device for which the alarm is registered.

As to claim 27, wherein said alerts are associated with the status of a plurality of components in a plurality of network servers (see col. 3-4).

As to claim 28, Bonnell discloses the claimed limitation wherein said display allows the user to select at least two alerts corresponding to at least two servers (see col. 3-4).

As to claim 2, Bonnell does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein one of said alerts relates to the status of a central processing unit. However, Dulman teaches a monitoring agent on computers throughout the network that reports alarms pertaining to a CPU (see fig. 9d).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bonnell in view of Dulman by providing alarms regarding the status of a CPU. One would be motivated to do so to provide status information regarding CPU utilization at the servers.

6. Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnell in view of Dulman, further in view of Giorgio, U.S. Patent No. 5,761,085.

As per claims 30-33 the rejection of claims 1-25, 27-29, and 34 is fully applied herein. Further, Bonnell does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein one of said alerts relates to the status of a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit. However, Giorgio teaches a method for monitoring various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit for equipment at network sites (see figs. 1-2; col. 4-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell in view of Giorgio so that various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit are monitored. One would be motivated to do so to optimize the working parameters of a network node.

7. Applicant's arguments filed July 6, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that; **A)** Bonnell does not teach an alert module configured to allow a user to selectively disable or enable a display of one or more alerts to the user of the computer; **B)** Bonnell does not disclose an alert module with variables which indicate whether the display of each of the alert notifications to the user is disabled or enabled; **C)** Bonnell does not teach a status module in a second computer which transforms a notification having a first data length into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein the second data length is significantly greater than the first data length; **D)** Bonnell teaches away from using SNMP for communication between agent software 36 and manager system software 34; **E)** in Bonnell, the knowledge module parser 44, knowledge module 38, knowledge database manager 46, database 47, manager software 34, and event manager 52 do not perform the same functionality as an index which is used by the claimed invention to identify a user-friendly display message.

In response to **A)**; Bonnell teaches an event manager executing in said processor, said event manager configured to selectively disable a display of one or more of said alerts to the user, said event manager further configured to record said status information associated with said alerts in a storage medium using event manager 210 and event repository 206, and the event filters specified by the user (see fig. 12; col. 9-12).

Bonnell does not explicitly state the limitation of an alert module. However, Bonnell discloses an event manager that is responsible for keeping a record of various occurrences throughout the computer including occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution (see col. 9-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying the event manger as taught by Bonnell as an alert module since the same functionality is achieved.

In response to **B)**; Bonnell discloses a data structure for implementing event filtering at the agent software which passes data regarding certain events to management consoles interested in

those events (see fig. 22; col. 13).

In response to C); Bonnell discloses that an event message is sent from agent software running on a server to the management software running on the management console (see figs. 15, 24, and 25; col. 13-14).

Bonnell discloses an object database manager 48 which creates and maintains a database 49 representing all of the resources and applications as objects, as well as information pertaining to the state of those objects, in a form that will be readily useable by a graphical user interface module 50. Graphical user interface 50 is responsible for communicating with display driver software in order to present visual representations of objects on the display of network management computer system 10. Such representations typically take the form of icons for objects. Also, graphical user interface module 50 coordinates the representation of pop-up windows for command menus and the display of requested or monitored data (see col. 2). It is notoriously well known in the art that object code that represents icons for displaying the notification messages is significantly greater than notification messages.

In response to D); Bonnell discloses an embodiment which includes an agent, collector, and a management console which uses SNMP traps to send messages concerning monitored resources (see figs. 27a-27b; col. 14-15). Furthermore, using SNMP transactions in a network is notoriously well known in the data communication network art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying transactions using SNMP for communications between agent software 36, and manager system software 36. One would be motivated to use SNMP transactions in a network to allow for the remote monitoring and updating of devices in the network and lessen the burden of problem management on the management console.

In response to E); The use of an index that points to a base of information is well known in the data processing art and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying an index in the event reported to the management console.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Graf, U.S. Patent No. 5,862,333 teaches a system for managing group of computers by displaying only relevant and redundant alert messages. Poliquin et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,696,486 teaches a method and apparatus for policy based alarm notification in a distributed network management environment. Dev et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,751,933 teaches a system for determining the status of an entity in a computer network. Grace, U.S. Patent No. 5,748,098 teaches event correlation in a computer network. Noble et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,944,782 teaches a event management system for distributed computing environment. Ote et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,815,652 teaches a computer management system.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for this

Serial No. 08/942,005
Art Unit 2758


12

Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Saleh Najjar

Examiner Art Unit 2758


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER